

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action dated September 13, 2007, claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 19 were rejected. Claims 9, 12, 15/13, 15/14 and 16-18 were objected to, but deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

With this Amendment, claims 9, 12, and 15-18 were amended, claims 20-23 were added and claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-14 and 19 were cancelled. Claims 9, 12 and 15-18 were revised for clarity, not substance. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Claims 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-23 are at issue.

### **I. Objection To Specification**

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as being non-descriptive. Per the Examiner's instructions, the title of the invention was amended from "Liquid Ejecting Head And Liquid Ejecting Device" to "A Liquid Ejecting Head Having Selectively Controlled Heat-Energy Evolving Elements Regions." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

### **II. Objection To Claims**

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10-19 because of antecedent basis problems. Per the Examiner's recommendations, the claims were amended to provide proper antecedent basis for each element.

The Examiner objected to claims 9, 12 and 15 and as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but deemed to contain allowable subject matter. The claims were rewritten in independent form, revised for clarification and amended to include the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Applicants respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn.

The examiner objected to claims 16-18 because of antecedent basis problems, but deemed to have allowable subject matter. The above claims were revised for clarification and amended to provide a proper antecedent basis for each element. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the above rejections be withdrawn.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP-0124312. The above claims were cancelled. Thus, this issue is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 13, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000